

# GEN. CASS' LETTER.

From the Washington Union.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 24, 1847.

Dear Sir: I have received your letter, and shall answer it, as frankly as I can. You ask me whether I am in favor of the acquisition of Mexico, and what my sentiments are with regard to the Wilmot Proviso?

I have so often and so explicitly stated my views of the first question, in the Senate, that it seems almost unnecessary to repeat them here. As you request it, however, I shall briefly give them.

I think, then, that no peace should be granted to Mexico, till a reasonable indemnity is obtained for the injuries, which she has done us. The territorial extent of this indemnity is, in the first instance, a subject of executive discretion. There the constitution has placed it, and there I am willing to leave it; not only because I have full confidence in its judicious exercise, but because, in the every-varying circumstances of a war, it would be indiscreet, by a public declaration, to commit the country to any line of indemnity, which might otherwise be enlarged, as the obstinate injustice of the enemy protracted the contest, with loss of blood and treasure.

It appears to me that the kind of metaphysical magnanimity, which would reject all indemnity at the close of a bloody and expensive war, brought on by a direct attack upon our troops by the enemy, and preceded by a succession of unjust acts for a series of years, is as unworthy of the age in which we live, as it is revolting to the common sense and practice of mankind. It would conduce but little to our future security, or, indeed, to our present reputation, to declare that we repudiate all expectation of compensation from the Mexican government, and are fighting, not for any practical result, but for some vague, perhaps some philanthropic object, which escapes my penetration, and must be defined by those who assume this new principle of national intercommunication. All wars are to be deprecated, as well by the statesman as by the philanthropist. They are great evils; but there are greater evils than these, and submission to injustice is among them. The nation, which should refuse to defend its rights and its honor, when assailed, would soon have neither to defend; and when driven to war, it is not by professional readiness and declarations of magnanimity, that its national objects can be best obtained, or other nations taught a lesson of forbearance—the strongest security for permanent peace. We are at war with Mexico, and its vigorous prosecution is the surest means of its speedy termination, and ample indemnity the surest guaranty against the recurrence of such a contest.

The Wilmot Proviso has been before the country some time. It has been repeatedly discussed in Congress, and by the public press. I am strongly impressed with the opinion that a great change has been going on in the public mind upon this subject—in my own as well as others; and that doubts are resolving themselves into convictions, that the principle it involves should be kept in view by the legislature, and left to the people of the confederacy in their respective local governments. The whole subject is a comprehensive one, and fruitful of important consequences. It would be ill-timed to discuss it here. I shall not assume that responsible task, but I shall confine myself to such general views as are necessary to the fair exhibition of my opinion.

We may well regret the existence of slavery in the Southern States, and wish they had been saved from its introduction. But there it is, and not by the act of the present generation; and we must deal with it as a great practical question, involving the most momentous consequences. We have neither the right nor the power to touch where it exists; and if we had both, their exercise by any means heretofore suggested, might lead to results which no wise man would willingly encounter, and which no good man could contemplate without anxiety.

The theory of our government presupposes that its various members have reserved to themselves the regulation of all subjects relating to what may be termed the internal police. They are sovereign within their boundaries, except in those cases where they have surrendered to the general government a portion of their rights, in order to give effect to the objects of the Union, whether these concern foreign nations or the several States themselves. Local institutions, if I may so speak, whether they relate to slavery, or to any other subject, are, within their limits, left to local authority, either original or derivative. Congress has no right to say that there shall be slavery in New York, or that there shall be no slavery in Georgia; nor is there any other human power, but the people of those States, respectively, which can change the relations existing therein; and they can say, if they will, we will have slavery in the former, and we will abolish it in the latter.

In various respects the Territories differ from the States. Some of their rights are inchoate, and they do not possess the peculiar attributes of sovereignty. Their relation to the general government is very imperfectly defined by the constitution; and it will be found, upon examination, that in that instrument the only grant of power concerning these views, is the phrase, "Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations, respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States." Certainly this phraseology is very loose, if it were designed to include in the grant the whole power of legislation over persons, as well as things. The expression, "the territory and other property," fairly construed, relates to the public lands, within their boundaries, docks, forts, ships, and all the various kinds of property, which the United States may and must possess.

But surely the simple authority to dispose of and regulate these, does not extend to the unlimited power of legislation; to the passage of all laws, in the most general acceptance of the word; which the constitution has excluded from the sentence. And, indeed, if this were so, it would render unnecessary any other provision of the constitution, which grants to Congress the power to legislate, with the consent of the States, respectively, over all places purchased for the "erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, docks, &c."—These being the "property" of the United States, if the power to make "needful" rules and regulations concerning them includes the general power of legislation, then the grant of authority to regulate "the territory and other property of the United States" is unlimited, wherever subjects are found for its operation, and its exercise needed no auxiliary provision. If, on the other hand, it does not include such power of legislation over the "other property" of the United States, then it does not include it over their "territory," for the same terms which grant the one, grant the other. "Territory" is here classed with property, and treated as such; and the object was evidently to enable the general government, as a property holder, to manage, preserve, and dispose of such property as it might possess, and which authority is essential almost to its being. But the lives and persons of our citizens, with the vast variety of objects connected with them, cannot be controlled by an authority, which is merely called into existence for the purpose of making rules and regulations for the disposition and management of property.

Such, it appears to me, would be the construction put upon this provision of the constitution, were this question now first presented for consideration, and not so controlled by imperious circumstances. The original ordinance of the Congress of the Confederation, passed in 1787, and which was the only act upon this subject, was the adoption of the constitution, providing a complete frame of government for the country north of the Ohio, while in a territorial condition, and for its eventual admission in separate States into the Union. And the persuasion, that this ordi-

nance contained within itself all the necessary means of execution, probably prevented any direct reference to the subject in the constitution, further than vesting in Congress, the right to admit the States formed under it into the Union. However, the circumstances arose, which required the Ohio, as over other territory, to be within and without the original Union, ceded to the general government; and, at various times, a more enlarged power has been exercised over the Territories—meaning thereby the different Territorial Governments—than is conveyed by the limited grant referred to. How far an existing necessity may have operated in producing this legislation, and thus extending, by rather a violent implication, powers not directly given, I know not. But certain it is, that the principle of interference should not be carried beyond the necessary implication, which produces it. It should be limited to the creation of proper governments for new countries, acquired or settled, and to the necessary provisions for their eventual admission into the Union; leaving, in the meantime, to the people inhabiting them, to regulate their internal concerns in their own way. They are just as capable of doing so, as the people of the States; and they can do so, at any rate, as soon as their political independence is recognised by admission into the Union. During this temporary condition, it is highly expedient to call into exercise a doubtful and invidious authority, which questions the intelligence of a respectable portion of our citizens, and whose limitation, whatever it may be, will be rapidly approaching its termination—an authority which would give to Congress despotic power, uncontrolled by the constitution, over most important sections of our common country. For, if the relation of husband and wife, of parent and child, and of any other condition which our institutions and the habits of our society recognise. What would be thought if Congress should undertake to prescribe the terms of marriage in New York, or to regulate the authority of parents over their children in Pennsylvania? And what would be said of a law, which justifying the interference of the national legislature in the cases referred to in the original States of the Union? I speak here of the inherent power of Congress, and do not touch the question of such contracts, as may be formed with new States when admitted into the confederacy.

Of all the questions that can agitate us, those which are merely sectional in their character, are the most dangerous, and the most to be dreaded. The warning voice of him, who from his character, and services, and virtue, had the best right to warn us, proclaimed to his countrymen, in his Farewell Address—that monument of wisdom for him, as I hope it will be of safety for them—how much he had to apprehend from measures peculiarly affecting geographical portions of our country. The grave circumstances in which we are now placed, make these words of wisdom doubly so for I am satisfied, from all I have seen and heard here, that a successful attempt to engraft the principles of the Wilmot Proviso upon the legislation of this government, and to apply them to new territory, should new territory be acquired, would seriously affect our tranquility. I do not suffer myself to foresee or to foretell the consequences that would ensue, for I trust and believe there is good sense and good feeling enough in the country to avoid them, by avoiding all occasions which might lead to them.

Briefly, then, I am opposed to the exercise of any jurisdiction by Congress over this matter; and I am in favor of leaving to the people of any territory, which may be hereafter acquired, the right to regulate it for themselves, under the general principles of the constitution. Because—

1. I do not see in the constitution any grant of the requisite power to Congress; and I am not disposed to extend a doubtful precedent beyond its necessity—the establishment of territorial governments when needed—leaving to the inhabitants all the rights compatible with the relations they bear to the confederation.

2. Because I believe this measure, if adopted, would weaken, if not impair, the union of the States; and would sow the seeds of future discord, which would grow up and ripen into an abundant harvest of calamity.

3. Because I believe a general conviction, that such a proposition would succeed, would lead to an immediate withholding of the supplies, and thus a dishonor to the nation, and to the war, this to a dispassionate observer at the seat of government can doubt this result.

4. If, however, in this I am under a misapprehension, I am under none in the practical operation of this restriction, if adopted by Congress, upon a treaty of peace making any acquisition of Mexican territory. Such a treaty would be rejected by the Senate. More than one-third of that body would vote against it, viewing such a principle as an exclusion of the citizens of the slaveholding States from a participation in the benefits acquired by the treasure and exertions of all, and which should be common to all. I am repeating—neither advancing nor defending these views. That presented to the Senate does not lie in my way, and I shall not turn aside to seek it.

In this aspect of the matter, the people of the United States must choose between this restriction, and the extension of their territorial limits. They cannot have both; and which they will surrender must depend upon their representatives first, and then, if these fail them, upon themselves.

It is to be seen, that it seems to be generally conceded, that this restriction, if carried into effect, could not operate upon any State to be formed from newly acquired territory. The well-known attributes of sovereignty, recognized by us as belonging to the State governments, would sweep before them any such barrier, and would leave the people to express and exert their will at pleasure. Is the short period as the duration of the Territorial governments, worth the price at which it would be purchased?—worth the discord it would engender, the trial to which it would expose our Union, and the evils that would be the certain consequence, let that trial result as it might? As to the course, which has been intimated, rather than proposed, of engraving such a restriction upon any treaty of acquisition, I persuade myself it would find but little favor in any portion of this country. Such an arrangement would render Mexico a party, having a right to interfere in our internal institutions in questions left by the constitution to the State governments, and would inflict a serious blow upon our fundamental principles. I feel, and I trust, there are among us, who would thus grant to a foreign power the right to inquire into the constitution and conduct of the sovereign States of this Union; and if there are any, I am not among them, and never shall be. To the people of this country, under God, now and hereafter, are its destinies committed; and we want no foreign power to intrude upon us, to treat in harm, and to say, "Why have you done this, or that? You left that undone, or that? You have violated the principles of national independence unite to repel such a proposition."

But there is another important consideration, which ought not to be lost sight of, in the investigation of this subject. The question that presents itself is not a question of increase, but of the diffusion of slavery. Whether its sphere be stationary or progressive, its amount will be the same. The rejection of this restriction will not add one to the class of servitude, nor will its adoption give freedom to a single being who is now placed therein. The same numbers will be spread over greater territory; and so far as compression, with less abundance of the necessities of life, is concerned, so far will it be less mitigated by transporting slaves to new country, and giving them a larger space to occupy.

I say this in the event of the extension of

slavery over any new acquisition. But can it go there? This may well be doubted. All the descriptions, which represent the condition of the Californias and of New Mexico, to the acquisition of which our efforts seem at present directed, unite in representing those countries as agricultural regions, similar in their products to our middle States, and generally unfit for the production of the great staples, which can alone render slave labor valuable. If we are not grossly deceived, and if it is difficult to see how we can be—the inhabitants of those regions, whether they depend upon their ploughs, or their herds, cannot be slave-holders. Involuntary labor, requiring the investment of large capital, can only be profitable when employed in the production of a few favored articles confined by nature to special districts, and paying large returns than the usual agricultural products spread over more considerable portions of the earth.

In the letter of Mr. Buchanan upon this subject, not long since given to the public, he presents similar considerations with great force. "Neither," says the distinguished writer, "the soil, the climate, nor the productions of California south of 36 deg. 30 m. nor indeed of any portion of it, north or south, is adapted to slave labor, and besides, every facility would be there afforded for the slave to escape from his master. Such property would be entirely insecure in any part of California. It is morally impossible, therefore, that a majority of the emigrants to that portion of the territory south of 36 deg. 30 m., which will be chiefly composed of our citizens, will ever re-establish slavery within its limits."

In regard to New Mexico, east of the Rio Grande, the question has already been settled by the admission of Texas into the Union. "Should we acquire territory beyond the Rio Grande and east of the Rocky mountains, it is still more impossible that a majority of the people would consent to re-establish slavery. They are themselves colored population, and among them the negro does not belong socially to a degraded race."

With this last remark Mr. Walker fully coincides in his letter written in 1844, upon the annexation of Texas, and which everywhere produced so favorable an impression upon the public mind, as to have conducted very materially to the accomplishment of that great measure. "Beyond the Del Norte," says Mr. Walker, "slavery will not pass; not only because it is forbidden by law, but because the colored race there preponderates in the ratio of ten to one over the whites; and holding, as they do, the government and most of the offices in their possession, they will not permit the enslavement of any portion of the colored race, which makes and executes the laws of the country."

The question, it will be therefore seen on examination, does not regard the exclusion of slavery from a region where it now exists, but a prohibition against its introduction where it does not exist, and where, from the feelings of the inhabitants and the laws of nature, "it is morally impossible," as Mr. Buchanan says, that it can ever re-establish itself.

It augurs well for the permanence of our confederation, that during more than half a century, which has elapsed since the establishment of this government, many serious questions, and some of the highest importance, have agitated the public mind, and more than once threatened the gravest consequences; but that they have all in succession passed away, leaving our institutions unscathed, and our country more united, in numbers, power, and wealth, and in all the elements of national prosperity, with a rapidly unknown in ancient or in modern days. In times of political excitement, when difficult and delicate questions present themselves for solution, there is one ark of safety for us; and that is, an honest appeal to the fundamental principles of our Union, and a stern determination to abide their dictates. This course of proceeding has carried us in safety through many a trouble, and I trust will carry us safely through many more, should many more be destined to assail us. The Wilmot Proviso seeks to take from its legitimate tribunal a question of domestic policy, having no relation to the Union, as such, and to transfer it to another created by the people for a special purpose, and foreign to the subject-matter involved in this issue. By going back to our true principles, we go back to the road of peace and safety. Leave to the people, who will be affected by this question, to adjust it upon their own responsibility, and in their own manner, and we shall render another tribute to the original principles of our government, and their guaranty for its permanence and prosperity.

I am, dear sir, respectfully, your obedient servant, LEWIS CASS. A. O. P. NICHOLSON, esq., Nashville, Tenn.

THE POST OFFICE AND RAILROADS. From the Philadelphia Ledger. Whenever the Post Office is involved in a dispute with any corporation of common carriers, whether on railroads, steamboats, or stage coaches, many of the newspapers, and no small portion of the public, invariably take for granted that the former is wrong, and that the latter are right. But, in every case which has thus far occurred, the former was right, and the latter were wrong. These errors of judgment and hasty condemnations are too often prompted by partisan animosities; political assumptions that, if the Post Office can be convicted of wrong, the conviction will inure to the benefit of their party. Whether "democrat" or "whig," every Postmaster General must expect this treatment from his partisan opponents; to condemn him, to make him a partisan capital for them, and to demand that they never investigate. Another source is the impatience of the mercantile and other portions of the community depending daily on the mails for letters or newspapers. If, through the arrangements of the Post Office, they encounter delay in the mails, they take for granted that the Postmaster General is wrong, and demand a remedy. This is a very dependent portion of the community would trace the evil to its source, and resolve to have the cause of the evil removed, they would not so frequently suffer through derangements in the mails, and the Postmaster General would have a much easier task in managing his department.

On the 22d inst. we published a letter from the Postmaster General, showing that he has been driven, by the extortion—that is the word—of the Richmond Railroad Company, to choose another route for the great southern mail, which causes a delay of twenty-four hours in its arrival in this city. This delay is a serious evil to every merchant and every newspaper in this community, and it is to be regretted that they should not tolerate, if they can find a remedy. But the first inquiry should be, "Where is the fault?" If they find it in the railroad company, then justice and policy demand that they should assemble in public meeting, express their opinions upon the conduct of this company, and ask Congress for stringent laws of prevention and remedy. The Postmaster General is bound by existing laws, and constrains them like his predecessors; they forbid him from acceding to the demands of the Richmond Railroad Company; force him to contract with another carrier, and he tells the whole to Congress. What should the people do? Ask Congress to restrain the company from controlling the Post Office, and to enable the Post Office to control the company. And what should Congress do? Comply with the wish of the people.

The Post Office is created for public convenience—for the benefit of the whole people. If the government cannot serve this purpose better than private enterprise, then it should abandon the monopoly of transporting the mails. If it can, then it should be armed with all necessary power, however extensive, over all common carriers, and the mails should be left to private enterprise, and the government cease, excepting on the main routes; and the

mercantile community of the large cities, always the first to complain of the government, and to encourage private enterprises and other opposition, would be the first and severest sufferers. Let them try it and be convinced. But if the government undertake to carry the mails—an undertaking from which the mercantile cities derive the first and greatest benefit—let them cordially put their shoulders to the governmental wheel, and help it out of every ditch dug by the extortion of private enterprise.

The constitution—clause 6 of sect. 8 of art. 1—says that "Congress shall have power to establish post-offices and post-roads." This gives to Congress the monopoly of carrying the mails, the power to control the postroads, which they establish, and to make any road a post-road. And such power is necessary to every national government; for, in times of war or public danger, necessity may require the interruption of all intelligence. Congress can, in times of public danger, proclaim martial law, and thus stop all tongues, pens, and presses, and consequently stop the carriage of all letters and newspapers. If, then, they can stop the whole in times of public danger, they should have the power to control the transportation of the whole in times of public safety. If, then, they can establish a post-road, and regulate the transportation of the mail over it, they can convert a mere road into a post-road, and regulate it accordingly.

But how shall Congress regulate a railroad? By compelling it to carry the mails for reasonable compensation, to be ascertained by arbitrators, if the Postmaster General and the railroad company cannot agree. But of this the company will complain as arbitrary power. We reply, that railroad companies exercise the arbitrary power of taking private property without the owner's consent, for their road depot; tax the public for transportation upon it, and exercise the very arbitrary power of extortion from the government, upon penalty of rejecting the mails. By the first of these arbitrary powers, they cause great inconvenience to private right; and by the last, to the whole people and their constituted authorities. If, then, the only remedy for the last be this arbitrary power in the government, public convenience demands that the government should possess it. Public convenience is the argument of transporting companies in taking private property and imposing tolls. If public convenience should keep the public in their power for these purposes, it should put them in the power of the government for the transportation of mails. With such governmental power, the people are at the mercy of the corporations, who may stop their mails entirely, or compel them to pay heavy taxes for transporting them. We hope that the people of this city will, on this occasion, have the manliness to support the government, and speak out against the rapacity of a corporation, instead of indulging in sneaking, pitiful complaints of their Postmaster General for complying with the laws.

## WILMINGTON JOURNAL.

Friday, January 7, 1848.

### AGENCY.

JAMES M. REEDMOND, Postmaster at Tarboro', is Agent for this paper, for Edgecombe and the adjoining counties. Mr. R. will take pleasure in receiving news, and reuniting for any moneys due in that section.

JOSEPH MARSH, Post's Buildings, corner of Hanover and Beaver streets, N. Y., is our agent, for receiving Advertisements in that city, for publication in the Journal. He will also receive subscribers for the same.

Mr. JAMES BURCH is our authorized agent to make collections due the "Journal" office in this town and county.

Mr. WASHINGTON COLLINS, Esq., is authorized to collect and give receipts for our paper in his neighborhood.

The readers of the Journal will please bear with us a short while. The Editor is absent, which will account for the want of the usual quota of Editorial.

MUNICIPAL ELECTION.—An Election was held in this town on Monday last, for the choice of seven gentlemen to compose the Board of Commissioners of Wilmington, for the ensuing year. The following is the result:

New Board.	Old Board.
G. W. Davis, 191	John McRae, 154
James Cassidey, 185	H. Nutt, 153
J. G. Wright, 191	G. Potter, 156
John Dawson, 190	J. Ballard, 148
B. Flanner, 187	George Davis, 157
John A. Taylor, 185	P. W. Fanning, 157
James T. Miller, 195	J. D. Bellamy, 161

The first meeting of the new Board of Commissioners was held last Wednesday night, when Col. James T. Miller was elected Magistrate of Police.

CONGRESS.—Our dates from Washington are only up to the 1st inst. It will be seen from our Congressional synopsis (compiled from the Union, National Whig, and Baltimore Clipper), that both Houses adjourned on the 30th last Monday.

GEN. CASS' LETTER.—We publish to-day a lengthy and able letter from Genl Cass, on the subject of the Wilmot Proviso, addressed to A. O. P. Nicholson, Esq., Nashville, Tenn. Without offering any comment of our own, we spread the letter before our readers. According to our notion of thinking, Gen. Cass, like all other leading statesmen of the Democratic party who have recently declared their sentiments on this momentous subject, deserves the thanks of the whole country for the noble stand he has taken.

LATEST FROM THE RIO GRANDE.—By the arrival at New Orleans of the steamship Telegraph, the Picayune has received dates from the Brazos to the 24th ult., and from Matamoros to the 22d ult. The Telegraph brings no news of importance. The Matamoros flag says that large numbers of Mexicans are emigrating to Texas, with a view of coming under the protection of the United States, in case the Rio Grande should be made the boundary line. According to the Monterey Gazette, Canales is still giving escort and receiving tribute from merchants. On the 22d instant, a train of carts, loaded with merchants' goods, are mentioned as having entered Monterey from Camargo, which came through under a very considerable sum.

ANOTHER NEW PAPER.—We have received the prospectus for a daily paper to be published in Wilmington, by Wm. Stringer and T. G. Haughton, at \$7 a year.

THE NORTHERN MAIL.—We see it stated in the correspondence of the Baltimore Sun, that the committee on Post Offices and Post Roads have determined to put the great mail again upon the Richmond route, but at the same time that Mr. Johnson offered! Well now, what if that route still refuses to carry it? The committee sustains the Postmaster General's course by this decision. We presume that the Richmond Company (i. e. Mr. Robinson) will be compelled at last to become reasonable.

The Raleigh Register, of the 29th inst., has quite a glorification over the following letter from Gen. Wool to Senator Badger, presented to the latter by Lt. Col. Fagg:

CAMARGO, Nov. 14, 1847.

My Dear Sir: I avail myself of a moment to say a word in behalf of your friend Lieut. Col. Fagg. He, as well as his Colonel, has most nobly done his duty. Both have commanded my admiration for their zeal, activity and efficiency in all the duties required of them. No two officers have more of any confidence than Col. Fagg and Lieut. Col. Fagg, and should an opportunity offer, I am sure they will do honor to themselves and country, in the field of battle.

Lieut. Col. Fagg can give you much valuable information, not only in regard to this line, but the country and its supplies. Finally, he is in all respects entitled to your special notice and kindness.

With the most respectful considerations, Believe me to be truly your friend, JOHN E. WOOL, U. S. A.

To the Hon. G. E. Badger, Senator in Congress, Washington.

The Register seems to think that this letter has fixed the matter, and that "Loco Focos" should now forever hold their peace. The Register ought to remember that such was Col. Paine's conduct, that all the company officers, whigs as well as democrats, with the exception of two, signed a paper requesting the Col. to resign; that the good of the Regiment and of the Service, required his doing so. The Register ought also to remember, that the writer of this "white-washing" letter, is the same man who "dishonorably discharged" from the service of the United States two officers, without having the shadow of law for so doing. Was Mr. Singletary, who was one of the discharged, a whig or a democrat? What does he say about the affair? Is Gen. Wool the only man whose statements and opinions are to be regarded in this matter? The people of North Carolina will answer no.

WHIG CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR.—Kenneth Rayner's withdrawal from the turf, has brought forth quite a host of whig candidates for the office of Governor of the good old North State. We do not now remember them all. Edward Stanley, Col. Joyner, Mr. Kerr, Charles Manly, Josiah Collins, William H. Washington, James W. Bryan, Dr. Fred Hill, Wm. B. Shepard, and Richard Hines, have all been brought out by their respective friends. Who is the man?

TENNESSEE AND THE HERO OF MONTEREY. The Legislature of Tennessee have, without distinction of party, invited Gen. Taylor to visit Nashville during the present session of that body. This is done, says the resolution, that the members of the Legislature may "testify to him, personally, their respect and regard."

METHODIST CONFERENCE.—Next Wednesday the day fixed upon for the meeting of the South Carolina Methodist Episcopal Conference, South. We understand that Bishop Andrews is expected to preside on the occasion.

A man named Sicbury, against whom there is an indictment for shooting his father in this county three or four years ago, was arrested in town on Monday, and placed in jail. He has been in Florida, we understand, since the matter was committed, and was on the point of leaving to go back there when arrested.

Chronicle, last Wednesday.

The War Office has received by the officers who have recently arrived from Mexico, various trophies of the war. Among them are two small beautiful brass wall pieces of ordnance sent by Gen. Scott, and brought to this city by Col. Andrews.

The most curious of these trophies is the black flag of the guerrillas. The material is bombazine. The ornament and letters in the centre, upon the red ground, are worked with green silk upon black cloth pieces, except the squares, which are worked with white. But the most remarkable is a small pennant on the top, made of black, 22 inches by 11 3/4, with various military ornaments. On the top and bottom are a death's head and cross-bones. In the centre, these ominous words: "No do cut!" were written in Quetzters. This staff and flag was taken at La Mira Flores, on the 13th of August, 1847, from the guerrillas who attacked Lieut. Hammond's party.—National Whig.

North Carolina Regiment.—The Raleigh Register contains a letter from its correspondent at Arispe's Mills, in Mexico, which mentions the deaths of David Williams and James W. Taylor, of the two Companies Pippin, of Company A, and Elijah Pippin, of Company B, of the North Carolina Regiment. In the month of October, Captain Roberts and Lieut. Thompson resigned, and there were 21 discharges on Surgeons' certificates of disability, (hesies 21 deaths in the whole Regiment,) for the same month, making an aggregate of 44. The letter is dated Nov. 20, and the writer adds: "The health of the Regiment has improved wonderfully in this month; up to the present date, no death has been reported, and but very few cases of sickness. We have very cool weather, which suits the boys exactly."

Tarboro, Press.

TERRIBLE CALAMITY.—Loss of Seventeen Lives. We find in the Cincinnati Commercial, the following account of a terrible calamity:

On the night of the 15th ult., at about 10 o'clock, just as they were preparing to go to bed, 32 persons who had taken refuge from the flood in the great new brick building, at the late Fourier Settlement, (the water having begun to give way, and discovered that the walls were falling.) Some jumped out into the water, whilst those that remained were crushed and buried in the ruins. In about five minutes the whole of that beautiful fabric, was a shapeless mass of immersed ruins, with but fifteen of its inmates breathing the breath of life!—Seventeen having found a tomb! Not a murmur or groan was heard from the crushed and smothered victims, for the waters swept darkly and deeply over them. The dim moonlight looked down calmly and undisturbed upon the wreck that overwhelmed the unseen dead, while the heart-rending cries from the living echoed fearfully in the hills.

In about ten minutes after the crash, two skiffs, one from Utopia, a town a short distance above, arrived and rescued the almost frozen survivors, who, after their escape from the building, had taken refuge upon drift logs, &c., and carried them safely to land.

Swords for Gens. Wool and Worth.—Two elegant swords, presents for Generals Wool and Worth, are now to be seen at the store of Ball, Tompkins & Black, in New York. They are both gold mounted. That for General Wool, was ordered by the Troy Common Council, and cost \$1,000. The citizens of Hudson and Kinderhook ordered that for Gen. Worth, at a cost of \$500. Like the other, the scabbard is of silver gilt, and the mountings are of gold. The hilt is surmounted with heads of Bacchus and a Bacchante, crowned with grape vines and fruit, and the scabbard is handsomely chased and ornamented.

Balt. Clipper.

# THIRTIETH CONGRESS, 1st Session.

We were in error in our last paper in stating that both Houses of Congress adjourned over from Monday to Wednesday, for the purpose of attending Senator Fairfield's funeral.

Tuesday, Dec. 28.

SENATE.—The Senate met to-day at the usual hour, and, after prayer by the Rev. R. B. Gurley, chaplain of the House of Representatives, the journal was read.

Mr. Niles, from the committee of arrangements, appointed to take charge of the funeral of the late Hon. John Fairfield, made a report, accompanied by sundry resolutions, one of which is as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, and place at the disposal of the Hon. Franklin Clark, for the funeral expenses of the Hon. John Fairfield, a sum equal to that usually expended in such cases, to be ascertained and drawn for by the committee of arrangements.

The resolutions having been unanimously agreed to, the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House, Mr. Hunt gave notice that he would introduce a joint resolution presenting the thanks of Congress to Gen. Winfield Scott and the army under his command.

Mr. Sawyer submitted a resolution, which was read, directing the Committee on Indian Affairs to inquire into the expediency of excluding all white traders from Indian territories, and confining the trade with the Indians to the Indian residents.

The States were called for petitions. Mr. Caleb B. Smith presented a petition from citizens of the State of Indiana, praying the abolition of slavery and slave trade in the District of Columbia. Mr. Cabell moved to lay it on the table. Mr. Root demanded the yeas and nays on this question; and, being taken, resulted—yeas 76, nays 70. So the petition was laid on the table.

A message was received from the Senate, communicating resolutions in relation to the attendance of both Houses at the funeral of the Hon. John Fairfield, late Senator from the State of Maine, at 4 o'clock this evening. The resolutions were concurred in, and the House then adjourned.

Wednesday, Dec. 29.

Several documents were received from the Treasury and Navy Departments. Several petitions and reports on private business were also submitted by Senators; which were severally read by their titles and appropriately referred.

Gen. Taylor introduced a bill from the Committee on Foreign Relations, providing for the further prosecution of the war with Mexico. Also, one providing bounty (as he was understood) for volunteers serving in the army of the United States. They were read twice by the tellers, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Atherton moved to take up House Bill No. 6, making appropriations for supplying, in part, the deficiencies growing out of the expenditure of the War Department for supplying the regulars and volunteers serving in Mexico. The bill calls for \$1,000,000.

Mr. Johnson, of Maryland, asked the chairman of the Committee on Finance what the whole deficiency was?

Mr. Atherton said that it amounted to near \$4,000,000.

The bill was then read three times and passed.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives appeared at the bar of the Senate, and announced the two resolutions of that body, which he was instructed to report to the Senate. One was in reference to the appointment of a Joint Committee on Printing, the other relating to the death of the Hon. Edward Bradley.

Mr. Crittenden called up the special order of the day, which was in reference to the purchase of the Mallon papers.

The Chair having put the question, The bill was then read twice and ordered to be engrossed. When it was about to be read a third time, and the yeas and nays being called for.

Mr. Butler rose and said that he would like to see the bill passed over by the present, and the could have an opportunity to examine, as he was not altogether prepared to give it his sanction now; and after some further debate, in which Messrs. Westcott and Badger participated, the bill was laid over till to-morrow.